

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

1: Human rights | www.enganchecubano.com

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

History of liberalism Liberal democracy traces its origins and its name to the European 18th-century, also known as the Age of Enlightenment. At the time, the vast majority of European states were monarchies, with political power held either by the monarch or the aristocracy. The possibility of democracy had not been a seriously considered political theory since classical antiquity and the widely held belief was that democracies would be inherently unstable and chaotic in their policies due to the changing whims of the people. It was further believed that democracy was contrary to human nature, as human beings were seen to be inherently evil, violent and in need of a strong leader to restrain their destructive impulses. Many European monarchs held that their power had been ordained by God and that questioning their right to rule was tantamount to blasphemy. These conventional views were challenged at first by a relatively small group of Enlightenment intellectuals, who believed that human affairs should be guided by reason and principles of liberty and equality. They argued that all people are created equal and therefore political authority cannot be justified on the basis of "noble blood", a supposed privileged connection to God or any other characteristic that is alleged to make one person superior to others. They further argued that governments exist to serve the people not vice versa and that laws should apply to those who govern as well as to the governed a concept known as rule of law. Some of these ideas began to be expressed in England in the 17th century. The idea of a political party took form with groups debating rights to political representation during the Putney Debates of 1689. After the English Civil Wars and the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689, the Bill of Rights was enacted in 1689, which codified certain rights and liberties. The Bill set out the requirement for regular elections, rules for freedom of speech in Parliament and limited the power of the monarch, ensuring that, unlike much of Europe at the time, royal absolutism would not prevail. These ideas and beliefs inspired the American Revolution and the French Revolution, which gave birth to the ideology of liberalism and instituted forms of government that attempted to apply the principles of the Enlightenment philosophers into practice. Neither of these forms of government was precisely what we would call a liberal democracy we know today the most significant differences being that voting rights were still restricted to a minority of the population and slavery remained a legal institution and the French attempt turned out to be short-lived, but they were the prototypes from which liberal democracy later grew. Since the supporters of these forms of government were known as liberals, the governments themselves came to be known as liberal democracies. The conservative monarchists who opposed liberalism and democracy saw themselves as defenders of traditional values and the natural order of things and their criticism of democracy seemed vindicated when Napoleon Bonaparte took control of the young French Republic, reorganised it into the first French Empire and proceeded to conquer most of Europe. Napoleon was eventually defeated and the Holy Alliance was formed in Europe to prevent any further spread of liberalism or democracy. However, liberal democratic ideals soon became widespread among the general population and over the 19th century traditional monarchy was forced on a continuous defensive and withdrawal. The dominions of the British Empire became laboratories for liberal democracy from the mid 19th century onward. In Canada, responsible government began in the 1840s and in Australia and New Zealand, parliamentary government elected by male suffrage and secret ballot was established from the 1850s and female suffrage achieved from the 1890s. Liberalism ceased being a fringe opinion and joined the political mainstream. At the same time, a number of non-liberal ideologies developed that took the concept of liberal democracy and made it their own. The political spectrum changed; traditional monarchy became more and more a fringe view and liberal democracy became more and more mainstream. By the end of the 19th century, liberal democracy was no longer only a "liberal" idea, but an idea supported by many different ideologies. After World War I and

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

especially after World War II , liberal democracy achieved a dominant position among theories of government and is now endorsed by the vast majority of the political spectrum. Rights and freedoms[edit] In practice, democracies do have limits on certain freedoms. There are various legal limitations such as copyright and laws against defamation. There may be limits on anti-democratic speech, on attempts to undermine human rights and on the promotion or justification of terrorism. In the United States more than in Europe, during the [Cold War] such restrictions applied to communists. Now they are more commonly applied to organisations perceived as promoting actual terrorism or the incitement of group hatred. Examples include anti-terrorism legislation , the shutting down of Hezbollah satellite broadcasts and some laws against hate speech. Critics claim that these limitations may go too far and that there may be no due and fair judicial process. The common justification for these limits is that they are necessary to guarantee the existence of democracy, or the existence of the freedoms themselves. For example, allowing free speech for those advocating mass murder undermines the right to life and security. Opinion is divided on how far democracy can extend to include the enemies of democracy in the democratic process. If relatively small numbers of people are excluded from such freedoms for these reasons, a country may still be seen as a liberal democracy. Some argue that this is only quantitatively not qualitatively different from autocracies that persecute opponents, since only a small number of people are affected and the restrictions are less severe, but others emphasise that democracies are different. At least in theory, opponents of democracy are also allowed due process under the rule of law. However, many governments considered to be democratic have restrictions upon expressions considered anti-democratic, such as Holocaust denial [citation needed] and hate speech, including prison sentences, oftentimes seen as anomalous for the concept of free speech. Members of political organisations with connections to prior totalitarianism typically formerly predominant communist, fascist or National Socialists may be deprived of the vote and the privilege of holding certain jobs. Discriminatory behaviour may be prohibited, such as refusal by owners of public accommodations to serve persons on grounds of race, religion, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation. For instance, the constitutions of Canada, India, Israel, Mexico and the United States guarantee freedom from double jeopardy , a right not provided in other legal systems. Also, legal systems that use politically elected court jurors, such as Sweden , view a partly politicised court system as a main component of accountable government, distinctly alien to democracies employing trial by jury designed to shield against the influence of politicians over trials. Similarly, many Americans consider the right to keep and bear arms to be an essential feature to safeguard the right to revolution against a potentially abusive government, while other countries do not recognise this as fundamental the United Kingdom, for example, having strict limitations on the gun ownership by individuals. Preconditions[edit] Although they are not part of the system of government as such, a modicum of individual and economic freedoms , which result in the formation of a significant middle class and a broad and flourishing civil society , are often seen as pre-conditions for liberal democracy Lipset There are various examplesâ€”for instance, in Latin America â€”of countries that were able to sustain democracy only temporarily or in a limited fashion until wider cultural changes established the conditions under which democracy could flourish. This is an especially difficult cultural shift to achieve in nations where transitions of power have historically taken place through violence. The term means in essence that all sides in a democracy share a common commitment to its basic values. The ground rules of the society must encourage tolerance and civility in public debate. In such a society, the losers accept the judgment of the voters when the election is over and allow for the peaceful transfer of power. The losers are safe in the knowledge that they will neither lose their lives nor their liberty and will continue to participate in public life. They are loyal not to the specific policies of the government, but to the fundamental legitimacy of the state and to the democratic process itself.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

2: Project MUSE - T.H. Marshall's "Citizenship and Social Class"

Universal suffrage, and complete equality in citizenship, the safeguards of democratic institutions: shown in discourses by Henry Ward Beecher, Andrew Johnson, and Wendell Phillips.

The Legal, Political, and Social backdrop A Political Obsession with Sect To truly understand how the seemingly simple subject of equal citizenship for Lebanese women has become such a difficult issue, one must review the fundamentals of political power in Lebanon. Even more, sectarianism has become so deeply entrenched in Lebanese society that it has become part of the national and collective ethos of its many constituencies, the majority of which owe their loyalties first to their sectarian leaders and political bosses. Banner held at a demonstration organized by the Nationality Campaign. Beirut, Riad Al Solh Square. No one knows the real, exact population breakdown of every sect. The last full census was conducted in Most analysts concede that the sectarian apportionment favors Christians disproportionately to their share of the population. As a percentage of the total population, they are clearly now a minority. Lebanese politicians fear the apportionment of important positions may one day be revised according to more accurate estimates. And yet, power-hungry and fear-mongering politicians are only one of the challenges campaigners faced. To appreciate the full extent of the headwinds confronting the campaign, one must delve more deeply into the social and legal context of Lebanese citizenship. Ottoman law of the early s made citizenship heritable from both mother and father. It prioritized the relationship of land *jus soli*. But a Westernized Ottoman citizenship law issued in modeled after the French statute prioritized a patrilineal relationship of blood *jus sanguinis*. In a further twist, the law gives foreign women more advantages than Lebanese women: The rule that children can only inherit citizenship from their fathers was once common in the Arab world, but since the beginning of the current century, many of the most prominent Arab states have amended their nationality laws, including Algeria, Egypt, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. An example is the treatment of the Palestinians, whose presence in the country figured prominently in the unfolding of the civil war. Lebanese law treats Palestinians harshly , restricting their ability to work, to receive social security and health care, and even to own property. According to the Taif Agreement that ended the fifteen-year civil war, naturalizing Palestinians is even unconstitutional in Lebanon. But they also reveal, less intentionally, that sectarian concerns have their limitsâ€”and that limit is an encroachment on male privilege. No one is overly concerned with the demographic imbalance that might ensue when a Lebanese man gives his nationality to his Palestinian wife and children. His rights rank higher in the minds of the Lebanese patriarchs than even their obsession with demographics. Politicians are aware of the hypocrisy and unfairness of the nationality laws. But they have also used that to their advantage, making gestures toward naturalization that are highly calculated to support their political and sectarian positions but do nothing to fundamentally change the inequity of the law. The precarious legal situation can easily be manipulated to serve political interests to create new electoral blocks. For example, the government of prime minister Rafik Hariri a Sunni, as the Lebanese prime minister always is signed a decree in that granted Lebanese nationality to more than eighty-eight thousand people. Although the decree is currently under legal scrutiny, most of those naturalized were Muslims, mainly Syrian nationals. The Nationality Campaign organizes demonstration in Riad Al Solh Square to push the newly created governmental committee to amend the nationality law. And in , before the end of his term, president Michel Suleiman a Maronite Christian, as the Lebanese president always is naturalized three hundred individuals, many of them Christian Palestinians. The number was not large, but still significant because it was wholly unconstitutional. In November , legislators formed an alliance between the two major representative Christian blocs in parliament the Free Patriotic Movement and the Lebanese Forces to pass a law that allows emigrants of Lebanese ancestry to attain citizenship. Christian politicians touted it as an opportunity to make demographic and political gains, though the official arguments for the law avoid sectarian language. All of this is but a superficial overview of the complex forces that have kept alive a law

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

that clearly has no place in a modern polity where men and women supposedly have equal rights. The leaders of the Nationality Campaign were experts in all these issues, and set out to design a broad attack on the legal and social barriers to advancement. Their design was clever. But as we shall see, it has not yet been enough to surmount all of these considerable obstacles. A united campaign won them the right to vote in , along with many other socioeconomic rights. Others are service-based and do not contest mechanisms of exploitation against women in their communities. The NCLW is today part of the Lebanese prime ministry and only works in a consultative capacity with the Lebanese government. The LWN is a coalition of a different nature designed to be more of a think-tank than a network of passive organizations. The activities of the LWN capped a half-century, beginning with universal suffrage in , in which women had asserted their importance to the social and economic development of Lebanese society. In scholastic circles and professional fields, Lebanese women excelled and became a symbol of liberalism in the Arab world. The stage was set, and their contributions gave them the authority and confidence to demand their political rights. They agreed that the nationality laws had to be addressed, once and for all. This thematic networking initiative around a common cause was unique: Leading activists decided to resist structural forms of violence in the media, in politics, the workplace, on the streets, and at home. In Lebanon, this meant finding new avenues of political expression. Formal political institutions had proved time and again that they could not accommodate women in powerful decision-making positions. CRTD-A leads workshops to train concerned women on how to promote a democratic culture within their communities. Lebanese women themselves did not always realize how the nationality law was shortchanging them. CRTD-A saw that concerned women needed to understand their own conditions of subordination, and to distinguish patriarchal structures and practicesâ€”in other words, to become agents of knowledge. They believed that narrating the story of the existing nationality law would highlight its origin in exploitative colonial practices, and its current anti-democratic role. To this end, CRTD-A commissioned a series of studies to review the historical record of the law and investigate its psychological and social implications on the families of women married to foreigners. In , a study by attorney Ziad Baroud reviewed the legal framework of the nationality law and proposed a new one. Baroud went on to become the an influential minister of interior from â€” At the same time, CRTD-A assisted university students in their research projects on the nationality law. In , the regional network of nationality campaigners prepared the film *My Child the Foreigner* by Christine Garabedian, which featured the hardships of select families of Arab women married to foreigners, especially in Egypt, Lebanon, and Morocco. The studies and the film worked as intended, initiating a newfound interest in citizenship rights in Lebanon and the Arab world. The scholarship on the nationality law reestablished a correlation between the concept of citizenship and the right of women to pass on their nationality to family members. The topic had entered the public conversation. It reconciled the need for leadership with the widespread rejection of hierarchy and authority among movement organizations. Awareness and enthusiasm would not carry the campaign alone, however. The Campaign Hits Its Stride The Nationality Campaign members recognized that their fight would require them to take on multiple roles at once, sometimes in seeming contradiction. For example, CRTD-A became both a challenger to the state and a service provider for concerned women and their families, sometimes in coordination with the state. Their work was at once oriented towards political decision-makers and the daily needs of their own constituency. The Nationality Campaign developed strategic alliances with supportive organizations, including the Lebanese media, research centers, key activists, and progressive political actors, and revived a culture of protest in the Lebanese public arena. This multifaceted approach gave the activists a good deal of flexibility and ample options for contingencies, if progress became blocked on one path or another. But it retained its service-provision, which kept its mission alive. Women were justifiably afraid their families would be persecuted, detained, or deported for lacking the necessary documentation. They simply did not know what to do or where to go. CRTD-A became their guide. When in the Lebanese government was finally formed, the campaign began enlisting some sectors of the political elite, including those that fought against it tooth and nail. According to El Masri, there were two roads to approach the state: CRTD-A decided to vigorously pursue

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

both roads in anticipation of the right window of opportunity. Meanwhile, they kept a close eye on explicitly discriminatory politicians. For example, members of the Change and Reform bloc, led by Michel Aoun, founder of the Christian Free Patriotic Movement, have raised some of the most racist objections to the nationality law. The campaign sustained close ties to key official figures such as the minister of state, Mona Ofeish, the minister of justice, Ibrahim Najjar, and the minister of the interior, Baroud, who had long sought to modernize legislation. For example, two years after CRTD-A succeeded in getting a ministerial decision that granted children equal access to public education, women informed the legal unit at CRTD-A that the Ministry of Education was denying their children access to public schools. CRTD-A immediately sent a petition to the ministry and privately pressed the minister to solve the misunderstanding. The ministry relented, and the children were enrolled. The Nationality Campaign organized one of their latest demonstrations against the nationality law near the French embassy in Beirut. The activists also made gains on some of the most odious regulations that derived from the nationality law. Many of the restrictions placed on residency and work permits were lifted. In , decree no. In , the campaign persuaded Baroud to propose a draft amendment to the nationality law to the cabinet. The draft proposed two possible formulations to Article 4, which deals with the nationality of children: That omission was due to the fact that the issue of Palestinian naturalization was still too controversial to touch. The amendment was promptly rejected. There was irony in this reasoning: There had been early signs of disagreements. Women married to Palestinians, for example, had a much more urgent interest in gaining citizenship for their husbands who had few rights in Lebanon than women married to foreigners of other nationalities. It was better to set the bar high and demand, from the outset, the right of women to give their nationality to their children and husbands, without any exceptions. It was also a matter of principle. We know that legal reform is not a miraculous process. I speak of the right of a Lebanese woman. A right is a right. And when you insist on framing it that way, the more irrational and unjust the law becomes to the general public. The campaign soon faced another organizational schism. CRTD-A refused to take part in the project.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

3: Policy Network - Reconsidering "Citizenship and Social Class"

Universal suffrage and complete equality in citizenship: the safeguards of democratic institutions.

This was not simply a social or economic claim. Once upon a time, this attitude stymied equality before the law, a liberal norm most of us would now take for granted. Once upon another time, it was used to forestall universal suffrage, now a democratic norm in any decent political order. Foes of at least many early ones -- of equality before the law or universal suffrage supposed that a society ought to be governed by natural aristocracy. This later became meritocracy for many of them. Surely, this marked considerable improvement, yet meritocracy was often conceived narrowly, evading consideration of how unearned social advantages or disadvantages shape life chances of most people. Let me pose this in a way that is not original yet, I think, revealing. Imagine two girls, both age five, with pneumonia. One, the daughter of well-off parents, lives in a well-to-do neighborhood. The other, daughter of a poorly or modestly paid working family, lives in outer boroughs. Why should the first girl receive better medical attention than the second? But how can she if you must do something in order to merit something else? Neither girl can be said to merit her mother and father or to have chosen them. Should both girls be told to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, or should both simply have access to equally good care? And what, then, of their possibilities for schooling? No, that is not a leap from one matter to another. There is -- I borrow from philosopher John Rawls and his followers -- a kind of birth lottery with enormous, unavoidable social consequences. The two girls may not have chosen their parents, but the society into which they are born is, like all societies, a matter of many human choices. Priorities are set by them, and these embody or are shaped by a range of values; they can be sustained or changed politically. For another, more recent example, Democrats recently legislated important if more narrow reform of the American health system. By now you are wondering: But consider the conceptual terrain touched so far: Think now of the institutions and some of the rights linked to each dimension of citizenship: They were presented with Britain in mind, first as a lecture in and then in published form in by this professor of sociology at the London School of Economics and later head of social sciences for UNESCO. The context is evident: Marshall spoke of the development of civil, political, and social citizenship as an evolutionary sequence. The rights embodied in the first pointed to those of the second, and the second to the third. Each, in succession, was secured over the three centuries following the Revolution. Marshall assumes that people are not simply egos batting about in artificially framed spaces that they happen to call nations or states. The kind of market fundamentalism that was rehabilitated closer to our times in the Thatcher-Reagan era is obviously at odds with this way of thinking. This thinking does not entail a simplistic negation of the positive accomplishments of classical liberalism or markets; it does propose that modern citizenship, as a status held by all, expands the domains of equality at the expense of social class, with its vestiges of a pre-modern hierarchy of privileged estates. The persistent enrichment of citizenship rights, thought Marshall, ought to render important powers associated with social differences. This has been challenged from the left on the grounds that economic inequalities too easily, even inevitably translate into undue political influence. Civil Citizenship Civil Citizenship came first and consolidated the rule of law and equality before the law. Yet a problem becomes obvious. If you accept equality before the law, must you not also accept equality in choosing lawmakers? The logic of civil rights subverts the idea that political rights should be restricted on account of social class. Political citizenship Political citizenship progresses in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Political rights caught up with civil rights. Alongside these, a labour movement grew and a Labour party went into parliament. The results of this trajectory are uncontroversial by the standards of liberal democracy. Social rights mitigate inequalities generated by market economies without abolishing markets. Here, again, one principle implies another: If yes, then decent education and living conditions must be aspects of citizenship. Without education, a citizen cannot make intelligent choices at the ballot box, and an uneducated citizenry also cannot sustain a minimally sophisticated economy. An educated citizen will be

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

better able to exercise a civil right like free speech. And so we begin to perceive that social citizenship does not quash individuality, but together with the other aspects of citizenship, fortifies the foundations on which it may flourish democratically; it enables individual citizens to fare well. Whatever the problems or weaknesses or costs of welfare states, whatever the difficulties in finding equilibrium between political community and markets, or between the state and civil society, or between public initiative and private innovation, this is evident: Political citizenship did not extinguish civil citizenship. If health services are available to all citizens as a social right, members of better-off classes will find their disposable income increased; they can spend otherwise fees they once paid private doctors. This means that powers derived from economic disparities are undercut. Critics from the right often insist that expenditures on social citizenship are inevitably too costly. This claim seems to me to slope in another, slippery and dangerous direction. He or she would "quite justly" -- be treated with scorn. There are, however, untoward occasions when civil liberties are temporarily compromised to a degree in a liberal democratic society "wartime, for instance. So these rights are also not always considered absolute. Concessions are demanded occasionally in less exacting circumstances too "if, say, one legitimate civil liberty conflicts with another legitimate civil liberty. It might well be that a free press has to be restricted sometimes in some degree to guarantee that an individual has a fair jury trial. If they did, the distinct concerns of their specific domains "civil, political, social -- would dissolve. Guaranteeing freedom of conscience is not the same as guaranteeing a fair vote or as making sure that a sick five year old member of your political community gets proper attention or insuring that her family will not be ruined financially to obtain it for her. The point is not to be blithe about expenditures on social citizenship; they are real "as real as, say, taxes. But I do mean to suggest the need for moral wariness, indeed unease, when financial claims are advanced simplistically against the basics of social citizenship. After all, why should a citizenry be any less derisive of the idea that costs should curtail civil liberties than of the idea that social rights -- say, those of our five year old -- are too costly? If conflicts like these arise, then the world-view of those who grapples with them becomes an urgent matter. Will it be public servants who fret greatly, are even sleepless about such trade-offs? Nations, Marx imagined, would dissolve as capitalism propelled itself worldwide, class struggle intensified and revolution brought a utopian future free of states and classes. They doubted that social structures would relentlessly and simply bifurcate, yielding a reactionary minority and a radicalized, homogenous majority. Since orthodoxy is, well, orthodoxy, this allowed dogma to remain in tact even if its historical protagonist changed. In fact, he presumes a national context. Those whom the birth lottery has placed in the 21st century are in circumstances that differ from his in various ways. This ought also to make us think about the fact that it is a birth lottery that gives most people automatic citizenship in this or that country. Challenges are also raised by these same processes to democracy itself; might it not weaken increasingly if political parties run for office advocating a set of policies but, on winning, lack sufficient fiscal tools to implement them? These are often as appealing as they are abstract. It is difficult they can take meaningful, practical form -- especially if we value self-government and are concerned to secure civil, political, and social rights. It is with these in mind that we ought to reread and reconsider "and still value " T. Still, I think they would be in the same trans-Atlantic party, together with people somewhat to the left and somewhat to the right of them.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

4: Is Democracy Compatible with Capitalism? Reconstruction in the US, | The Brooklyn Rail

Excerpt from Universal Suffrage, and Complete Equality in Citizenship: The Safeguards of Democratic Institutions: Shown in Discourses It was a natural transposition to slavery and the status of the negro in this State.

Israel Prison Service , Life imprisonment in Israel , and List of countries by incarceration rate Regarding the conditions of imprisonment of prisoners, including security prisoners the Israel Prison Service term for Palestinian prisoners , Israel is committed to two international treaties: Johnson , the consular officer who wrote the cables, was terminated from the United States Foreign Service later that year; the cables became the focus of controversy when their contents became public in The report concluded that Israeli authorities were aware that "physical coercion and mistreatment" probably had been used to obtain the confessions. The second part of the Landau report remains secret, it is believed to contain guidelines for permissible interrogation methods. In isolated cases, interim orders were issued temporarily prohibiting the ISA from using all or some of the methods, but in September the High Court refused to rule whether they are legal under Israeli and international law. In , Israel ratified the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of , a measure which states Article 7 "no one shall be subjected to torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment". Critics say Israel is also in breach of section 2 2 of the Convention against torture which stipulates that, "No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture. Others to be tortured include brothers and other relatives of persons listed as "wanted" and any Palestinians in the engineering profession. In some cases, wives of the detained have been arrested and mistreated to further pressure their husbands. ISA agents have sometimes tortured Palestinians in order to recruit them as collaborators. However, the Israel Medical Association declared the legislation unethical and urged doctors to refuse to implement it. This is not a vested right but a benefit, contingent on good behavior, with prison authorities paying their university tuition. The courses are in the fields of: Political prisoners Main article: Ban said the release of political prisoners would "serve as a significant confidence-building measure" and boost prospects of peace in the region. So do the Israeli security forces. There were many political prisoners on Robben Island but there are more Palestinian political prisoners in Israeli jails. Administrative detention Administrative detention is a procedure under which prisoners are held without charge or trial. The sentences are authorized by an administrative order from the Israeli Ministry of Defence or Israeli military commanders. Amnesty International believes that the practice breaches Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which "makes clear that no-one should be subjected to arbitrary detention and that deprivation of liberty must be based on grounds and procedures established by law". Amnesty International is also concerned that prisoners of conscience are being "held solely for the non-violent exercise of their right to freedom of expression and association". In their ruling, the judges stated that the right to free university education does not apply to those convicted of terror offenses. The ruling did, however, call on prison authorities to be "considerate" in deciding the cases of prisoners already in the midst of academic programs. According to the US Department of State report on Israel, "[t]he law provides for freedom of speech and of the press, and the government generally respected these rights in practice subject to restrictions concerning security issues. This led to the criticism that "the authorities took disproportional steps, unjustifiably infringing on the right to political expression and protest. According to the press freedom organization Reporters Without Borders , "The Israeli media were once again in the only ones in the region that had genuine freedom to speak out. Reporters without borders explained the change was due to Israeli actions in Operation Pillar of Defense during which it said "Israel Defense Forces intentionally attacked journalists and buildings where media connected to Hamas had premises". The organization also criticized arrests of Palestinian journalists and military censorship. Previously, Israel have been the only country in the region ranked with a "Free" media. Mohammad Bakri , an Israeli Arab, directed the film. The investigations would entail inquiries into the funding of several human rights groups that have

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

criticised Israeli policies. The Association for Civil Rights in Israel described the decision as a "severe blow" to Israeli democracy, and critics labeled the policy as "McCarthyist". Israeli human rights groups had petitioned against the law, saying it infringes on freedom of speech. Supporters of the law say it prohibits "discrimination based on geography. The most important speech is political, and people should have the ability to express their opinions without fear of government sanctions. The Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance prohibits expressing support for an organization deemed to be illegal or terrorist in nature. Freedom of the press , Freedom of the Press report , and List of freedom indices Reporters Without Borders publishes an annual report on worldwide press freedom, called the Press Freedom Index. The first such publication began in The results for Israel and the Palestinian Authority from to the present are shown below, with lower numbers indicating better treatment of reporters:

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

5: Henry Ward Beecher - Amherst, MA - Dead Poets' Society Memorials on www.enganchecubano.com

Universal suffrage and wide franchise= - equality of political rights Both UK parl and devolved parl/assemblies can pass laws e.g. Scotland - devolved health laws Public are not personally involved in office holding but do this via a representative.

Is Democracy Compatible with Capitalism? From the conservative right to the social-democratic left, there is a consensus that private property and competitive markets are the only foundation for legal equality, universal suffrage, and representative government. Any and all attempts to go beyond capitalism will inevitably produce political despotism, dictatorship, and repression. The anti-capitalist left has long rejected such claims. For most of the twentieth century, capitalism coexisted with open dictatorships in Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain and much of the global South. In societies that had elected governments, suffrage was restricted to property owners before World War I. Even with the establishment of the right to vote for all adults after , the ability of capitalists to dominate and manipulate ostensibly democratic governments has been well documented. The late Ellen Meiksins Wood grappled with the paradoxical relationship between capitalism and democracy. However, the rise of popular and labor movements made the exclusion of the working class from suffrage impossible. To reconcile capitalism and democratic forms, the scope and meaning of democracy was radically transformed. The tumultuous class conflicts of this eraâ€”between capitalist manufacturers and workers in the North, and landowning planters and their ex-slaves in the southâ€”reshaped the meaning of democracy. In these struggles, every advance of the substantive democratic power of workers or former slaves challenged capitalist dominance. The stabilization of capitalism required the radical restriction of democracy in the form of liberalism in the north, and legal racial segregation, disenfranchisement and racial terror in the south. At the beginning of the Civil War, the Radical Republicansâ€”a small minority of the party based among successful commercial farmers and small town professionals 4â€” alone advocated a revolutionary war that would abolish chattel slavery in the south. The Lincoln administration initially ordered Federal commanders to return runaway slaves to their masters. However, the numbers of slaves fleeing the plantations and seeking refuge with Union troops led to the Emancipation Proclamation, which declared all slaves in Confederate controlled territories free as of January 1, The war ended with the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which made legal-juridical freedom the national legal framework for labor. The destruction of slavery through the self-activity and self-organization of the slaves also radicalized northern public opinion. In the north, the Radicals sought to preserve a social order based in small-scale manufacturing, employing skilled labor and market-driven household-based agricultural production. Only a minority considered the possibility of confiscating the lands of the former planters and distributing them to the freed people. However, all were convinced that a southern labor-market, free of legal and juridical coercion, would allow former slaves to earn wages that would allow them to become independent farmers or artisans. For the Radicals, popular power was unrestrained except for the wishes of the majority. Capitalist manufacturers were also drawn to Radicalism. While the average manufacturing firm employed only 8. While most unskilled workers were unable to create lasting unions, skilled workers had established twenty-one national craft unions and dozens of municipal labor councils by Workers attempted to win the eight-hour day through direct industrial action, and political agitation for state legislation to limit the working day to eight hours. However, individual Radical Republicans supported eight hour laws that lacked any enforcement mechanisms in Congress and northern state legislatures. Radicalism ceased to be the dominant trend in the Republican Party after the nomination of Grant in , as the Radicals lost support among the manufacturers and their program for the southâ€”nationally guaranteed citizenship and voting rights for the freedmenâ€”was realized with the election of Republican state governments across the former Confederacy. While committed to defending the civil and political rights of African-Americans in the South and preserving protective tariffs and inflationary paper money, the Stalwarts were political pragmatists whose main goals were winning and maintaining public office. The Stalwarts were

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

willing to use Federal and state funds to subsidize railroad construction, charter private corporations, and otherwise promote capitalist development. The depression of and the subsequent sharpening of class struggle in the north pushed the industrial capitalist to embrace a new world view—liberalism. The cyclical recovery of produced a new wave of strikes against wage cuts and the intensification of work, particularly among railway workers. Faced with renewed employer demands for wage reductions, rail workers launched national strikes in , which took near insurrectionary form in major towns and cities across the US. Only the use of Federal troops crushed the rebellion of . The Liberals rejected the Radical equation of democracy with the substantive and unrestrained power of the majority. In the aftermath of the collapse of slavery in , the Lincoln administration pursued contradictory policies regarding the future of agricultural class relations in the south. The majority of northern capitalists correctly feared that any distribution of land to the ex-slaves would lead to the development of a subsistence peasantry as it had in the post-emancipation Caribbean. By the end of the war in April , the Federal officials committed themselves to restoration of the plantations on the basis of legally free wage labor. These conventions accepted the abolition of slavery, but extended neither citizenship nor the suffrage to the freedmen. The wartime experiences of mass flight from the plantations and Union military service raised the political and social confidence of the freed people. The south saw a veritable explosion of self-organization among the freedmen in the summer and fall of . Former slaves pooled resources and built their own churches and schools, and organized hundreds of cultural and political organizations. The most important were the Union Leagues. Under the leadership of Union veterans and skilled artisans, the Leagues acted as both unions and political organizations demanding equal citizenship and suffrage. First, the freedmen withdrew female and juvenile labor from the plantations. They routinely left employers during the harvest, despite fines and loss of wages, because they were able to gain significantly higher wages from other employers. These unions often evolved into the Union Leagues, which became the backbone of the southern Republican Party. Northern Republicans, merchants, and manufacturers responded ambivalently to the development of legally coerced wage labor in the south. On the one hand, cotton merchants and manufacturers wanted a rapid restoration of plantation production. On the other hand, the Radicals and Conservatives rejected any and all legal-judicial coercion of the freedmen and were appalled at the rise of paramilitary violence in the south. Despite their concerns about reviving cotton production, most Republican Conservatives followed the lead of the Radicals in and . Over , newly enfranchised African Americans—the majority of voters in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—went to the polls. The new state conventions were elected in the Fall of , met in early , and drafted constitutions that guaranteed universal male suffrage and citizenship. The Republicans swept to power across the most of the south in the Spring of on the votes of newly enfranchised freedmen and white yeoman farmers. The new southern governments repealed the Black Codes and began to radically reorganize social relations in the south. Rather than realizing the utopian vision of a capitalist plantation agriculture based on juridically free labor, Republican dominance in the south led to the break-up of the plantations and the emergence of a new, non-capitalist form of social labor, share-cropping tenancy. Increasingly, planters across the cotton belt competed with one another for labor, leading to rising wages. In the late s, the planters began to abandon centralized gang labor on the basis of wage labor, leased land in forty to eighty acre lots to freedmen and their families. Although the majority of elected and unelected positions in the new southern governments went to white Republicans from the north, the reliance of the new regimes on the votes and political activity of the freedmen and upcountry whites gave these Reconstruction governments a radical, non-capitalist character. The southern peasant-citizens used their substantive political power, in ways reminiscent of the peasant-citizens of Ancient Athens, to defend their class positions against the landlords. Across the south, Republican governments built public schools, hospitals, orphanages, and asylums. While these public institutions were de facto segregated by race, legal racial segregation of public institutions, accommodations, and transport was illegal across the south before the s. The new state governments also repealed discriminatory poll taxes and licenses, and established property taxes on landed property. Lien laws gave first claim on the crop to farmers and laborers, protecting white yeoman

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

farmers and black sharecroppers from the landlords and merchants. As the northern manufacturers became increasingly conservative in response to sharpening class confrontations with the northern working class in the s, they progressively abandoned the freedmen. During the second Grant administration, the Liberals effectively blocked Congressional renewal of the Enforcement Acts, which had allowed the federal military to repress the Klan in , or pass a new Civil Rights Act. The white Republicans who controlled the most important public offices in the south, like Republicans in the north, issued bonds and allocated funds to build railroads across the south in the late s and early s. As in the north, the result was widespread corruption of government officials, rising public debt and new taxes. The revived Klan, the White Leagues and other racist paramilitary organizations broke up Republican meetings, assassinated white and black Republican leaders, and intimidated African-American voters across the south. The contested Presidential election of , in which the Democrat Tilden received a majority of popular votes in the midst of massive violence and electoral fraud in the south, marked the end of Reconstruction in the south. However, the Democratic representatives of the planters and merchants rolled back key advances of the Reconstruction government. First, the Redeemers cut government spending, reducing funding for the public schools and hospitals both black and white farmers had relied upon. Finally, they made local sheriffs, justices of the peace, and county commissioners appointed, rather than elected, officials, effectively purging African-Americans from these positions and removing the checks these black peasant-citizens had imposed on the planters and merchants in their dealings with their sharecropping tenants. The landlord-merchant would provide food, clothing and agricultural supplies the sharecropper needed to initiate and survive the agricultural production cycle. In exchange, the landlord-merchants, who were the only source of credit and goods in a region, would charge inflated prices and usurious interest. Each year, the sharecroppers found themselves with little or no surplus after the sale of the cotton crop. As they were no longer able to produce the majority of their food, clothing, and household items, they were forced to borrow from local merchant-creditors to purchase these items. Like the African-American sharecroppers in the black belt, the upcountry white farmers were charged inflated prices for consumer goods and usurious rates of interest by local merchant-monopolists. The possibility of a national populist coalition of northern industrial workers and southern black and white farmers in the s and s sparked a new planter counter-offensive, supported by northern capital. By the late s, planters in the cotton belt divided their lands between lots leased to sharecroppers and lots cultivated by wage workers under their supervision. Instead, they worked under the supervision of the planter in centralized gangs. In the north, the labor-capital struggle led the manufacturers to embrace liberal democracy—universal suffrage was preserved, but the scope of activity of the democratic state was limited to the preservation of individual property rights. In the south, the development of a substantive peasant-democracy in the late s and s consolidated non-capitalist sharecropping. Only the destruction of that radical plebian democracy and the creation of a racially-exclusive suffrage, backed up by legal and extra-legal violence and terror, allowed the consolidation of capitalism in southern agriculture after Put another way, the experience of Reconstruction provides yet another example of the incompatibility of substantive democratic power and capitalist class relations. *Renewing Historical Materialism* New York: Cambridge University Press, , Chapter 7. *The Foundations of Athenian Democracy* London: Democracy Against Capitalism, p. Oxford University, Press , Chapter 4. Sven Beckert, *The Monied Metropolis*: Cambridge University Press, , Chapters 3–4. The following is based first and foremost on W. Random House, 7. David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans*, New York: Knopf, , pp. Beckert, *Monied Metropolis*, pp. Beckert, *Monied Metropolis*, Chapter 2.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

6: Equality | www.enganchecubano.com

Universal suffrage, and complete equality in citizenship, the safeguards of democratic institutions: shown in discourses by Henry Ward Beecher, Andrew Johnson, and Wendell Phillips. Gamblers and Gambling.

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen; Declaration of Independence , most ethical theorists have treated rights as something that must be derived. Historical development The expression human rights is relatively new, having come into everyday parlance only since World War II , the founding of the United Nations in , and the adoption by the UN General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in . It replaced the phrase natural rights, which fell into disfavour in the 19th century in part because the concept of natural law to which it was intimately linked had become controversial with the rise of legal positivism. Legal positivism rejected the theory, long espoused by the Roman Catholic Church , that law must be moral to be law. The term human rights also replaced the later phrase the rights of Man, which was not universally understood to include the rights of women. Origins in ancient Greece and Rome Most students of human rights trace the origins of the concept of human rights to ancient Greece and Rome , where it was closely tied to the doctrines of the Stoics , who held that human conduct should be judged according to, and brought into harmony with, the law of nature. According to the Roman jurist Ulpian , for example, natural law was that which nature, not the state, assures to all human beings, Roman citizens or not. It was not until after the Middle Ages , however, that natural law became associated with natural rights. Thomas Aquinas , these doctrines recognized the legitimacy of slavery and serfdom and, in so doing, excluded perhaps the most important ideas of human rights as they are understood today—freedom or liberty and equality. The conception of human rights as natural rights as opposed to a classical natural order of obligation was made possible by certain basic societal changes, which took place gradually beginning with the decline of European feudalism from about the 13th century and continuing through the Renaissance to the Peace of Westphalia. During this period, resistance to religious intolerance and political and economic bondage; the evident failure of rulers to meet their obligations under natural law; and the unprecedented commitment to individual expression and worldly experience that was characteristic of the Renaissance all combined to shift the conception of natural law from duties to rights. The intellectual—and especially the scientific—achievements of the 17th century including the materialism of Hobbes , the rationalism of Descartes and Leibniz , the pantheism of Spinoza , and the empiricism of Bacon and Locke encouraged a distinctly modern belief in natural law and universal order and, during the 18th century—the so-called Age of Enlightenment , inspired by a growing confidence in human reason and in the perfectibility of human affairs—led to the more comprehensive expression of this belief. Particularly important were the writings of Locke, arguably the most important natural-law theorist of modern times, and the works of the 18th-century thinkers known as the philosophes, who, centred mainly in Paris, included Montesquieu , Voltaire , and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The philosophes, building on Locke and others and embracing many and varied currents of thought with a common supreme faith in reason, vigorously attacked religious and scientific dogmatism, intolerance, censorship , and social and economic restraints. Not surprisingly, this liberal intellectual ferment exerted a profound influence in the Western world of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Together with the Glorious Revolution in England and the resulting Bill of Rights, it provided the rationale for the wave of revolutionary agitation that swept the West, most notably in North America and France. Thomas Jefferson , who had studied Locke and Montesquieu, gave poetic eloquence to the plain prose of the 17th century in the Declaration of Independence proclaimed by the 13 American colonies on July 4, We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. It was, indeed, the failure of rulers to respect the principles of freedom and equality that was responsible for this development. In the first place, because it was frequently associated with religious orthodoxy, the doctrine of

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

natural rights became less attractive to philosophical and political liberals. Additionally, because they were conceived in essentially absolutist terms, natural rights were increasingly considered to conflict with one another. Most importantly, the doctrine of natural rights came under powerful philosophical and political attack from both the right and the left. In England, for example, conservative political thinkers such as Edmund Burke and David Hume united with liberals such as Jeremy Bentham to condemn the doctrine, the former out of fear that public affirmation of natural rights would lead to social upheaval, the latter out of concern lest declarations and proclamations of natural rights substitute for effective legislation. Agreeing with Bentham, Hume insisted that natural law and natural rights are unreal metaphysical phenomena. This assault upon natural law and natural rights intensified and broadened during the 19th and early 20th centuries. John Stuart Mill, despite his vigorous defense of liberty, proclaimed that rights ultimately are founded on utility. And the logical positivists of the early 20th century insisted that the only truth is that which can be established by verifiable experience and that therefore ethical pronouncements are not cognitively significant. Indeed, under the influence of 19th-century German idealism and parallel expressions of rising European nationalism, there were some—the Marxists, for example—who, though not rejecting individual rights altogether, maintained that rights, from whatever source derived, belong to communities or whole societies and nations preeminently. The persistence of the notion Although the heyday of natural rights proved short, the idea of rights nonetheless endured. The abolition of slavery, the implementation of factory legislation, the rise of popular education and trade unionism, the universal suffrage movement—these and other examples of 19th-century reformist impulses afford ample evidence that the idea was not to be extinguished, even if its a priori derivation had become a matter of general skepticism. But it was not until the rise and fall of Nazi Germany that the idea of human rights truly came into its own. Many of the gruesome atrocities committed by the Nazi regime had been officially authorized by Nazi laws and decrees, and this fact convinced many that law and morality cannot be grounded in any purely idealist or utilitarian or other consequentialist doctrine. Certain actions, according to this view, are absolutely wrong, no matter what the circumstances; human beings are entitled to simple respect, at least. Today the vast majority of legal scholars and philosophers—particularly in the liberal West—agree that every human being has, at least in theory, some basic rights. Indeed, except for some essentially isolated late 19th-century and early 20th-century demonstrations of international humanitarian concern, the last half of the 20th century may fairly be said to mark the birth of the international as well as the universal recognition of human rights. Among the basic questions that have yet to receive conclusive answers are the following: Even when the principle of human rights is accepted, there are controversies: It is thus sometimes claimed that there exists no universally agreed upon theory or even understanding of human rights. The nature of human rights: Five in particular stand out, though not even these are without controversy. First, regardless of their ultimate origin or justification, human rights are understood to represent both individual and group demands for political power, wealth, enlightenment, and other cherished values or capabilities, the most fundamental of which is respect and its constituent elements of reciprocal tolerance and mutual forbearance in the pursuit of all other such values or capabilities. Consequently, human rights imply both claims against persons and institutions impeding the realization of these values or capabilities and standards for judging the legitimacy of laws and traditions. At bottom, human rights qualify state sovereignty and power, sometimes expanding the latter even while circumscribing the former as in the case of certain economic and social rights, for example. Human rights partake of both the legal and the moral orders, sometimes indistinguishably. Fourth, most assertions of human rights—though arguably not all freedom from slavery, genocide, or torture are notable exceptions—are qualified by the limitation that the rights of individuals or groups in particular instances are restricted as much as is necessary to secure the comparable rights of others and the aggregate common interest. Finally, if a right is determined to be a human right, it is understood to be quintessentially general or universal in character, in some sense equally possessed by all human beings everywhere, including in certain instances even the unborn. In stark contrast to the divine right of kings and other such conceptions of privilege, human rights extend in

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

theory to every person on Earth, without regard to merit or need, simply for being human or because they mitigate inherent human vulnerability or are requisite to social justice. In several critical respects, however, all these postulates raise more questions than they answer. For instance, if, as is increasingly asserted, human rights qualify private power, precisely when and how do they do so? What does it mean to say that a right is fundamental, and according to what standards of importance or urgency is it so judged? What is the value of embracing moral as distinct from legal rights as part of the jurisprudence of human rights? Do nonjusticiable rights harbour more than rhetorical significance? When and according to what criteria does the right of one person or group of people give way to the right of another? What happens when individual and group rights collide? How are universal human rights determined? Are they a function of culture or ideology, or are they determined according to some transnational consensus of merit or value? If the latter, is the consensus in question regional or global? How exactly would such a consensus be ascertained, and how would it be reconciled with the right of nations and peoples to self-determination? Is the existence of universal human rights incompatible with the notion of national sovereignty? For some in the human rights debate, this raises a further controversy concerning how such situations comport with Western conceptions of democracy and representative government. In other words, though accurate, the five foregoing postulates are fraught with questions about the content and legitimate scope of human rights and about the priorities, if any, that exist among them. Like the issue of the origin and justification of human rights, all five are controversial. The content of human rights: Therefore, to understand better the debate over the content and legitimate scope of human rights and the priorities claimed among them, it is useful to note the dominant schools of thought and action that have informed the human rights tradition since the beginning of modern times. Inspired by the three themes of the French Revolution, they are: Nor is it to imply that one generation is more important than another, or that the generations and their categories of rights are ultimately separable. The three generations are understood to be cumulative, overlapping, and, it is important to emphasize, interdependent and interpenetrating. Belonging to this first generation, thus, are rights such as those set forth in Articles 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including freedom from gender, racial, and equivalent forms of discrimination; the right to life, liberty, and security of the person; freedom from slavery or involuntary servitude; freedom from torture and from cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment; freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile; the right to a fair and public trial; freedom from interference in privacy and correspondence; freedom of movement and residence; the right to asylum from persecution; freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; freedom of peaceful assembly and association; and the right to participate in government, directly or through free elections. Also included are the right to own property and the right not to be deprived of it arbitrarily—rights that were fundamental to the interests fought for in the American and French revolutions and to the rise of capitalism. The right to security of the person, to a fair and public trial, to asylum from persecution, or to free elections, for example, manifestly cannot be assured without some affirmative government action. What is constant in this first-generation conception is the notion of liberty, a shield that safeguards the individual—alone and in association with others—against the abuse of political authority. This is the core value. In large part, it is a response to the abuses of capitalist development and its underlying and essentially uncritical conception of individual liberty, which tolerated, and even legitimized, the exploitation of working classes and colonial peoples. Nevertheless, most of the second-generation rights do necessitate state intervention, because they subsume demands more for material than for intangible goods according to some criterion of distributive justice. Second-generation rights are, fundamentally, claims to social equality. On the other hand, as the social inequities created by unregulated national and transnational capitalism become more and more evident over time and are not directly accounted for by explanations based on gender or race, it is probable that the demand for second-generation rights will grow and mature, and in some instances even lead to violence. The three remaining claimed solidarity or group rights—the right to peace, the right to a clean and healthy environment, and the right to humanitarian disaster relief—suggest the impotence or inefficiency of the state in certain

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

critical respects. All of these claimed rights tend to be posed as collective rights, requiring the concerted efforts of all social forces, to a substantial degree on a planetary scale. However, each of them also manifests an individual dimension. It is important to note, too, that the majority of these solidarity rights are more aspirational than justiciable in character and that their status as international human rights norms remains somewhat ambiguous. Thus, at various stages of modern history, the content of human rights has been broadly defined, not with any expectation that the rights associated with one generation would or should become outdated upon the ascendancy of another, but expansively or supplementally. Such dynamics are reflected, for example, in a rising consensus that human rights extend to the private as well as to the public sector¹. Nor should broad acceptance of the idea of human rights suggest that their generations or their separate elements have been greeted with equal urgency. The suggestion that first-generation rights are more feasible than other generations because they stress the absence over the presence of government is somehow transformed into a prerequisite of a comprehensive definition of human rights, such that aspirational claims to entitlement are deemed not to be rights at all. The most-compelling explanation for such exclusions, however, has more to do with ideology or politics than with operational concerns. Persuaded that egalitarian claims against the rich, particularly where collectively espoused, are unworkable without a severe decline in liberty, first-generation proponents, inspired by the natural law and laissez-faire traditions, are committed to the view that human rights are inherently independent of organized society and are necessarily individualistic. This liberty-equality and individualist-collectivist debate was especially evident during the period of the Cold War , reflecting the extreme tensions that then existed between liberal and Hegelian - Marxist conceptions of sovereign public order. Although Western social democrats during this period, particularly in Scandinavia, occupied a position midway between the two sides, pursuing both liberty and equality² in many respects successfully³ it remains true that the different conceptions of rights contain the potential for challenging the legitimacy and supremacy not only of one another but, more importantly, of the sociopolitical systems with which they are most intimately associated. The relevance of custom and tradition: The viewpoint underlying this assertion⁴ that the scope of human rights in any given society should be determined fundamentally by local, national, or regional customs and traditions⁵ may seem problematic, especially when one considers that the idea of human rights and many of its precepts are found in all the great philosophical and religious traditions. Nevertheless, the historical development of human rights demonstrates that the relativist critique cannot be wholly or axiomatically dismissed. Nor is it surprising that it should emerge soon after the end of the Cold War. Against the backdrop of increasing human rights interventionism on the part of the UN and by regional organizations and deputized coalitions of states as in Bosnia and Herzegovina , Somalia, Liberia , Rwanda , Haiti , Serbia and Kosovo , Libya , and Mali , for example , the relativist viewpoint serves also as a functional equivalent of the doctrine of respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity , which had been declining in influence not only in the human rights context but also in the contexts of national security, economics , and the environment. As a consequence, there remains sharp political and theoretical disagreement about the legitimate scope of human rights and about the priorities that are claimed among them. Inherent risks in the debate On final analysis, however, this legitimacy-priority debate can be dangerously misleading. Although useful for pointing out how notions of liberty and individualism have been used to rationalize the abuses of capitalism and Western expansionism and for exposing the ways in which notions of equality, collectivism, and culture have been alibis for authoritarian governance, in the end the debate risks obscuring at least three essential truths that must be taken into account if the contemporary worldwide human rights movement is to be understood objectively. First, one-sided characterizations of legitimacy and priority are very likely, at least over the long term, to undermine the political credibility of their proponents and the defensibility of the rights they regard as preeminently important. In an increasingly interdependent global community, any human rights orientation that does not support the widest possible shaping and sharing of values or capabilities among all human beings is likely to provoke widespread skepticism. The period since the mid-th century is replete with examples, among them the official U. Second, such characterizations do not

**UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP,
THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf**

accurately reflect reality.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

7: Human rights in Israel - Wikipedia

Political Equality: universal suffrage for all, one person one vote Equality of Opportunity: everybody should have equal life chances, and the same access to things like health, education, employment opportunities etc.

Now seen as ace. Plato and Aristotle saw democracy as a system of rule by the masses at the expense of wisdom and property. Aristotle was worried that sophists could demand authority in democracy – wanted an aristocracy instead. Mob rule – considered fatal to individual freedom and to all the graces of civilised living. Now we are all democrats. As major ideologies faltered in the late 20th Century, the flame of democracy appeared to burn more strongly. It emerged as perhaps the only stable and enduring principle in the postmodern political landscape. Origins can be traced back to Ancient Greece. Much democracy has come from Athenian democracy. People champion democracy due to positive connotations when in fact it means nothing unless it is defined more specifically – end of history concept. Fukuyama and the view that capitalist democracy represents the final stage of the development of human political and economic institutions. What this makes clear is that democracy links government to the people, but that this link can be forged in a number of ways: This notion is not now accustomed to being associated with democracy. One core feature of democracy – principle of political equality, notion that political power should be distributed as widely and evenly as possible. Political equality – all have the same input and chance to participate. However, some more equal than others. Majoritarianism – system of decision-making in which decisions approved by the largest grouping problems over minority rights. Participation – providing opportunities for citizenship to become involved in the political process. Accountability – calling to account the decisions reached by politicians through elections or other forms of political involvement. To what extent is government accountable and answerable to Commons? How, in a democracy, can a committee of the Commons find itself prevented from interviewing civil servants? Representation – entrusting the power of decision-making to another citizen, usually a professional politician basis for modern concepts of democracy. However, within what body should this power be distributed? BUT every democratic system has restricted political participation – early Greek writers: Greek city-states – only male citizens over 20 considered citizens. Universal suffrage not established in UK until etc. Contradicts any form of majoritarianism and also implies that only unanimous decisions can be binding upon the people, thus dramatically restricting the application of democratic principles. Limitations on voting in modern societies – J. Can take a number of forms: Could lead to tyranny of the majority. More common form of democratic participation is the act of voting, which is the central feature of representative democracy. When citizens vote, they do not so much make the decisions that structure their own lives as choose who will make those decisions on their behalf. What gives voting its democratic character is that provided the election is competitive, it empowers the public to make politicians accountable. Advocates of representative democracy have wished to confine popular participation in politics to the act of voting, precisely because they fear that the general public lack the wisdom, education and experience to rule wisely on their own behalf. Liberal view on democracy Models of democracy constructed on the basis of liberal individualism have usually proposed that democracy be restricted to political life, with politics being narrowly defined. From this view, the purpose of democracy is to establish, through some process of popular participation, a framework of laws within which individuals can conduct their own affairs and pursue their private interests. Democratic solutions are appropriate only for matters that specifically relate to community; used in other circumstances, democracy amounts to an infringement of liberty. Social and radical democrat view on democracy Democracy is a general principle that is applicable to all areas of social existence. People are seen as having a basic right to participate in the making of any decisions that affect their lives, with democracy being the collective process through which it is done. Needs to be a balanced between needs of society and protection of individual rights. Direct democracy Athenian state – The Ecclesia, limited citizenship, executive appointments by lot and limited time span in office. Key principles – popular

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

sovereignty – people can have the power. Aristotle saw as poor imposing rule on the wealthy – society dominated by property less masses. Equal rights and say. Qualifying majority vote can ensure some unanimity. Not a simple Early criticisms – Plato – belief in natural hierarchy requiring rule by guardians – who guards the guardians however? Aristotle dangers of mob rule. Renewed support – Rousseau – support for participatory democracy where civic virtue only way of maintaining social cohesion through community – direct democracy involvement based on all citizens participating in law making. What is the best for everyone? Could be majority of selfish wills. For Rousseau, the common good is something which benefits all individuals but may not coincide with felt interests. It is NOT the will of all individuals added together and averaged, nor is it the will of the majority. Renewed support – Fourier – small scale communities based on self-rule and communal decision-making. Modern problems of direct democracy – apathy; population sizes; complexity of problems and levels of commitment – how can you vote so regularly if you work? Also idea of elite theory and natural inequality Mosca and Pareto. Dangers of populism de Tocqueville. Representative democracy Accepted to be most practical. Twin principles of representation and democracy. Regular free and fair elections. Existence of competing interests and factions polyarchy. Contentious point as it is elitist. Whether or not pressure groups are truly competitive is questionable: Limited government with constitutional guarantees protective democracy and commitment to individual liberty. Supreme courts and HRA are almost constitutional safeguards – quasi-constitutional government. Representation is a conduit for the popular consent that legitimate government itself in liberal thought. Delegatory – electorate control over actions of representative. Paine – regular interchange between citizens and representatives to avoid corruption. Much needed interchange between citizen and rep. Link is needed in representative democracy – popular sovereignty. The favouring of referendums to supplement the representative process. BUT – delegate model provides broader opportunities for popular participation and serves to check the self-serving inclinations of parties – comes as close as poss. Disadvantage – breeds narrowness and fosters conflict – Burke feared this: Limited control of the trustee outside of elections. Elitist implications – once elected, representatives exercise individual judgement. Also has anti-democratic implications – if politicians think for themselves because public is ignorant, then surely it is a mistake to allow public to elect reps in the first place. Radical democrat view – Paine – if politicians are allowed to exercise own judgement, they will simply use that latitude to pursue their own selfish interests: Resemblance – parliament should be a microcosm of society at large. Bevan – can an MP represent a mine working constituency if he has never been a miner? A representative sample, therefore, is one which has the same proportions of men and women, rich and poor, black and white, or young and old, as the population at large, an impression of whose opinion is being sought. Needs to be some level of resemblance, as otherwise politicians find it incredibly hard to represent a group of individuals whom they have no common ground with. The model suggests that only people who come from a particular group, and have shared the experiences of that group, can fully identify with its interests. Critics argue it is anti-democratic – social engineering limits free choice of representatives by electors. Mandate – the electorate votes for the party label, not the individual candidate. As it is the party, rather than individual politicians, that is the agency of representation, the mandate model provides clear justification for party unity and party discipline. In effect, politicians serve their constituents not by thinking for themselves or acting as a channel to convey their views, but by remaining loyal to their party and its policies. Unless a political party could encompass the desires of the entire electorate, including minorities, then this model of representation would not suit the needs of representative democracy. Criticism - voters are not always the rational and well-informed creatures that this model suggests – they can be largely affected by short-term goals and promises of party pledges, rather than the manifesto commitments that would help the country in the long run. Criticisms Rousseau – personal sovereignty is inalienable. Representative assemblies will become corrupted by sectional interests and lose sight of General Will. Increasing alienation and apathy with democratic institutions. Direct and representative democracy Both based on democratic principles: Differences Varying degrees of popular input – electoral

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

accountability versus direct decision-making. Different attitudes towards ability of citizens. Logistical problems of direct democracy outweigh the practical benefits of direct democracy. Models of Democracy Classical democracy Same as Athenian democracy. Credentials for being democratic "basis on political equality, popular sovereignty and majoritarianism" government by the people and for the people. Limitations as a model "limited citizenship, applicability for modern mass society, dangers of populism and demagogues. Protective democracy Protection from themselves and from over mighty government.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

8: Birth of a nation: how Australia empowering women taught the world a lesson

Once upon another time, it was used also to forestall universal suffrage, now a democratic norm in any decent political order. Foesâ€”at least many early onesâ€”of equality before the law or universal suffrage supposed that a society ought to be governed by natural aristocracy.

Traditional characterizations of kinds of treatment as either egalitarian or inegalitarian often turn out to be disguised value judgments or empty statements. It is possible, however, to find descriptive criteria apt to capture the egalitarian and inegalitarian features of principles which have been advocated at different times. Equality must be construed here in the sense of similarity, that is, of agreement in certain properties. That men are equal means that men share some qualities; these must be specified. Men are evidently unequal in many characteristics. There are natural differences sex, color, character traits, natural endowments, etc. Other properties are common to all but in varying amounts age, strength, intelligence, possessions, power, etc. Moralists ever since the Stoics have claimed that men, in spite of differences of character or intelligence, are of equal dignity, worth, or desert. Statements of this kind are to be interpreted in a normative sense, to the effect that all men are entitled to be treated equally. The same applies to the allegation that all men have the same moral or natural rights. To say that I have a moral right implies that others should let me exercise it whereas to have a legal right means that it is conferred by positive law. Whether individuals or groups are, in fact, treated equally or unequally by others depends on the way in which benefits or burdens are allotted to them. These may be legal rights e. Factual statements about equality may be about equality of either characteristics or treatment. Normative statements about equality are always concerned with treatment but may contain references to characteristics as well, as when it is being argued that men should be treated equally because they are equal in certain characteristics. References to both characteristics and treatment are also contained in general rules of the type: This leads to the question of how to determine whether an actual or proposed kind of treatment is egalitarian. Traditional criteria of egalitarianism 1 Impartiality. Equal treatment means, first of all, the impartial allocation of some benefit or burden by one actor to another, say, by a judge to a claimant. Equality before the law thus means impartial application of the law. Allocations are impartial or partial only by reference to a rule of allocation. Partiality allotments made in violation of some given rule would be the only kind of inegalitarian treatment in this sense. Since any ruleâ€”for example, one restricting suffrage to adult citizens or to white citizensâ€”can be applied impartially or partially, we must determine the conditions under which rules themselves are to be considered egalitarian. Rules which allocate a benefit or burden in equal amounts to everyone are undoubtedly egalitarian. Most rules of allocation grant equal shares of some kind, not to all generally but to all who are equal with respect to some property; for example, all adult citizens have the right to vote; whoever commits a certain crime shall suffer a certain punishment; persons within the same income bracket are liable to the same income tax. According to the previous criterion, such rules would not be egalitarian. Universal suffrage means that the right to vote is given to all adult citizens but not to minors and aliens. A graduated income tax treats any two taxpayers within the same bracket equally and any two within different brackets unequally. To treat all whites alike and all Negroes alike but persons of different color differently is to practice racial discrimination. Every conceivable rule treats equals in some specified respect equally and unequals unequally. A flat rate and a graduated income tax both fulfill the requirement of proportional equality. Inequality in allotment has been held to be egalitarian provided it is based on relevant differences in personal characteristics. Thus, age and citizenship are relevant to voting rights but not so sex or race or wealth; it is therefore held egalitarian to limit the franchise to adult citizens but inegalitarian to restrict it to men or whites or poll-tax payers. Wealth is relevant to taxation; hence, a graduated income tax is viewed as egalitarian but not a sales tax , which disregards this relevant criterion by taxing poor and wealthy buyers at the same rate. Judgments to the effect that characteristic x is relevant to treatment y are valualational, not factual. That color is not relevant to voting but age is means that it is unjust to base the

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

franchise on color and just to require a minimum age. Equality becomes tantamount to distributive justice: Or, in a recent formulation: To be both egalitarian and just, these must therefore be based on proportionate equality on the basis of desert. His claim that color is relevant to intelligence would be an empirical one and could be refuted on empirical grounds, but it is intelligence rather than color or desert which he proposes in this case as a relevant criterion for granting franchise. According to criteria 3 and 4, every rule of allocation is egalitarian, and any rule may be considered just and hence egalitarian according to criteria 5 and 6. Operational criteria of egalitarianism

- 1 Egalitarian rules of allocation and distribution. Even advocates of racial discrimination are likely to consider it egalitarian to give preferential treatment to the needy regardless of race but inegalitarian to give it to whites regardless of need. This points to a distinction which must be made between
- 1 rules which determine how some benefit or burden is to be allocated among persons, that is, how much of it is to be given to each or to be taken from each, and
- 2 rules concerning the distribution of a benefit or burden which is to result from some allocation, that is, how much each person is to have at the end.

Rules of allocation and rules of distribution may be a egalitarian or b inegalitarian. Rules of allocation are egalitarian if they allocate the same kind or amount of benefit or burden to all. Similarly, rules of distribution are egalitarian if they stipulate that all are to have equal shares. Here are some examples: Egalitarian allocations often lead to egalitarian distributions and inegalitarian allocations to inegalitarian distributions. Universal suffrage promotes political equality, not so suffrage for whites only. But an egalitarian distribution does not necessarily require an egalitarian allocation. For example, to bring about an equal distribution of the holdings of A, who has 8 units, and of B, who has 2, it is necessary to take, say, 3 from A and to give 3 to B. But taking 1 from A and 1 from B would leave the previous inequality of their distribution unaffected. Egalitarian allocations may thus result in inegalitarian distributions. A rule of allocation which is intrinsically inegalitarian may thus be egalitarian with respect to some egalitarian rule of distribution, while an intrinsically egalitarian rule of allocation may be inegalitarian in this respect. With respect to equality or rather, to reducing inequality of wealth, a graduated income tax is egalitarian and a head tax is inegalitarian. Universal suffrage which excludes only minors and aliens is more egalitarian than suffrage which excludes also Negroes and may therefore be considered fully egalitarian for practical purposes. Disenfranchising women is more inegalitarian than disenfranchising Negroes if the latter constitute a small segment of the population but less inegalitarian if Negroes form a large percentage. On the basis of these purely descriptive criteria, persons with divergent value commitments can agree or disagree on an empirical level whether a given rule of allocation or of distribution is egalitarian and to what degree, and whether a rule of allocation is egalitarian with respect to some egalitarian rule of distribution. The resulting classification corresponds in a satisfactory way to our everyday distinctions between egalitarian and inegalitarian treatment. Instances of egalitarianism

Equality of opportunity. Equal treatment of all in every respect was advocated by some nineteenth-century anarchists: Most egalitarians, however, consider such an ultimate goal neither desirable nor possible. They realize that in every society individuals are bound to have varying degrees of ability and to hold positions that yield varying degrees of status if not of remuneration. How to match unequal individuals with unequal positions has been their central concern and equality of opportunity their principal answer. This rule deals with the distribution of access to positions in society, not with the allocation of the positions themselves. If everyone has an equal start, then the position he will occupy at the end will, in theory at least, depend exclusively on how far and how fast he runs, that is, on his own resourcefulness but also on his luck. As the French Declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed: Equality of legal rights has been, historically, the first of these special equalities. Equal satisfaction of basic needs. Equality of opportunity does presuppose the equal allotment of certain rights, but it also requires the application of another egalitarian rule of distribution, namely, equality of the satisfaction of certain basic needs, which in turn calls for an inegalitarian rule of allotment: Indeed, those who lack the basic physical or educational necessities do not have the same opportunities to reach the higher positions as do the better endowed. To bring the former up to the general starting line, government must compensate them for these initial disadvantages by means of social legislation and social services such as

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

minimum wages, tax exemptions, unemployment benefits, free public schools, and scholarships. Equality of opportunity is not simply a matter of legal equality. Its existence depends, not merely on the absence of disabilities, but on the presence of abilities. It obtains in so far as, and only in so far as, each member of a community, whatever his birth, or occupation, or social position, possesses in fact, and not merely in form, equal chances of using to the full his natural endowments of physique, of character, and of intelligence. Tawney [], pp. Privileges for nobles or property owners and disabilities imposed on a particular sex, religion, or race are inegalitarian, not only in themselves but probably also with respect to any conceivable egalitarian rule of distribution. But privileges for religious, racial, or ethnic minorities may constitute an egalitarian policy when these are considered as constituting economically or socially disadvantaged groups. Equality of the right of property is compatible with extreme inequality in the distribution of property. The equal satisfaction of basic needs as a precondition for equality of opportunity does require economic equality, that is, a reduction of extreme inequalities in the distribution of commodities. With respect to this goal, unequal taxation of unequal incomes is egalitarian. Common ownership of the means of production. If there is equality of opportunity and if higher positions bring higher salaries, both will go to those of greater merit or ability. Unequal allocation of rewards, correlated with inequality of ability, is a consequence of equal distribution of opportunities. With respect to equality of opportunity, rewards according to merit in the sense of ability is therefore an egalitarian principle. This is not so with rewards according to merit in the sense of desert. Each is to be assigned the function corresponding to his pre-established desert. For the same reason, all rigidly stratified societies are inegalitarian, from feudalism to the Indian caste system. To each according to his need. Equality of opportunity does not, however, necessarily entail that rewards as well as positions go to each according to his ability. With respect to equality of opportunity to occupy various positions, this would be another egalitarian rule of allocation. While some political thinkers have advocated the equalization of political power through direct democracy or predicted the abolition of political power through the withering away of the state, it is generally assumed that political power is ubiquitous and always unevenly distributed and that political equality can only mean equality of opportunity to participate in the political process. Political equality has therefore been associated with the democratic institutions of suffrage, representation, and majority rule. Early liberals did not include political rights among the basic rights to be given to all; they demanded merely that wealth should replace birth as a criterion for franchise. Extending suffrage to all property owners was originally an egalitarian demand directed against hereditary privileges of the nobility. Property qualifications for voting rights became an inegalitarian rule when it was invoked in defense of vested property interests against proponents of universal suffrage which was not instituted in most countries until the decline of laissez-faire liberalism. Egalitarianism and other social goals Egalitarian rules may conflict not only with one another for example, equality of rights and of opportunities, equality of opportunities and of welfare but also with other social goals. The equal distribution of welfare does not necessarily lead to its maximization.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

9: Second-Class Citizenship

Universal suffrage means that every citizen has the right to vote regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, religion, physical disability, sexual orientation, property considerations, or level of education.

She had been summoned to the White House as somewhat of a curiosity. Intelligent, inquisitive, and quite often irreverent, the young woman waited until she was bidden to enter. When the door opened she saw President Theodore Roosevelt, sitting with his feet up on the desk. He rushed to greet the elegantly attired woman, grabbing her hand and pumping it up and down in his vice-like grip. I am delighted to meet you. And with that enthusiastic embrace, Vida Goldstein became the first Australian to meet an American president at the White House. Goldstein addressed huge American audiences on one of the most controversial global issues of the day: Only the vote would unravel the vast web of legal, economic and social disadvantage that ensnared women and girls the world over. Furthermore, Goldstein ardently believed that women should enter parliament, as Australian women alone in the world were entitled to do. Such a simple premise; such a revolutionary idea. Though prim in fashion and chaste in manner, she was both enfant terrible to the established order and darling of the avant-garde. But why, in that second northern winter of a new century, did the commander-in-chief of the United States of America seek an audience with a charismatic activist from the deep planetary south? The simple answer is that Teddy Roosevelt was a political progressive. Goldstein was the most fully enfranchised woman he could yet hope to meet and he was keen to see what a member of this new breed looked like. While Roosevelt was a steadfast believer in votes for women, the American Congress would not abide it. US congressmen put up the same arguments as conservative opponents to universal adult suffrage the world over, including numerous anti-suffrage women. In the words of one Australian politician, if women could vote, what would prevent them from seeking: Yet the woman now taking tea with the president was decidedly feminine, despite the fact that she came from the country where women had more political rights than anywhere else in the world. In , New Zealand had become the first country to give women the right to vote in national elections. But in , the newly federated nation of Australia became the only country where white women could both vote and stand for election on a universal and equal basis with white men. This dual right “the complete electoral franchise and eligibility to sit in parliament” was what political philosopher John Stuart Mill termed: In the very moment of its creation, Australia had instantly become a world leader. The secret ballot, the eight-hour day and the wage arbitration system are regularly touted as democratic landmarks with Australian origins. The little band of Americans who initiated the modern [suffrage] movement would never have predicted that “the island continent of Australia, then unexplored wilderness, would become a great democracy where self-government would be carried on with such enthusiasm, fervor and wisdom that they would give lessons in methods and principles to all the rest of the world. Catt then specifically referred to Goldstein as the bearer of these unexpected lessons. Yet remarkably, this bizarre land now: Goldstein was both the literal messenger and a representative of the feminist ideals that Catt associated with Australia. Goldstein was fully aware of the leadership role she had been asked to play. She told a packed house during her address to the 34th American National Suffrage Convention in Washington in March that: Woman suffrage is with us to stay, and that our success may hasten the day when you American women will stand before the world as political equals of your menfolk is the earnest desire of the countries which have sent me here to represent them at this great conference. But it was not always a relationship of mutual admiration. Goldstein was critical of her host country. She told Australian audiences: Most of us regard America as the most democratic and advanced country politically in the world. A democratic form of government does not necessarily mean that the people rule. Goldstein offered an analysis of the root cause of the hypocrisy: In general, Goldstein was a fan of Roosevelt, but she was not a sycophant. The [Australian] Federal Franchise Bill is the greatest step in the direction of political equality that we have yet seen, and must be a splendid object lesson [her emphasis] to every civilised country in the world. Changes at home and abroad If America

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

was slow to take the Australasian lead, by Finland and Norway had joined Australia and New Zealand in enfranchising women. But imperialism connected British suffragists more closely to the Australian electoral experiment, providing inspiration and example. She was always at pains to point out that, lo, the sky had not fallen and women had not been unsexed by their new political identity as equal citizens. Suffragists, however, were keen to stress the gendered nature of Australian progressivism, and were quick to note how crucial votes for women had been in igniting the flame of social change. Prior to winning the franchise, the infant mortality rate in Australia was deaths per babies. A decade later, the rate had dropped to Goldstein attributed the decline in infant mortality to the introduction of pure food laws and raising the age of consent. Further examples of progressive and protective actions initiated by women were pensions for invalids, pure milk laws, early closing hours for pubs and technical education for girls. Goldstein directly attributed the success of reformist legislation to the mobilisation of female voters "many of whom would sit in the galleries of the parliament when any bill affecting women and children was debated and then interview members of parliament to urge alterations and amendments. Suffrage as part of a wider movement In Australia, the suffrage dream was closely aligned with other utopian visions of social and political transformation. Sparked by the gold rushes of the s, a potent amalgam of socialists, spiritualists, dissenters, eclectics, theosophists, pacifists, feminists, unionists, Unitarians, vegetarians and garden-variety liberal democrats all converged on Australia in a remarkably non-volatile brew of ideas and optimism. NLA The birth of the Australian Commonwealth was channeled through a series of constitutional conventions held in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide from to The issue was never really whether the six Australian colonies would federate, but how. This would require diminishing the power of the colonies or expanding some of their laws to benefit all citizens across the new Commonwealth. It was this question of uniformity "whether all women would now achieve federally what South Australian women had won locally in " that set Australia on its course to democratic distinction. Frederick Holder, a keen federalist and treasurer of South Australia when women won their historic victory in , insisted that any agreement honour the existing rights of individual colonists. Holder moved to add a clause that read: No elector now possessing the right to vote shall be deprived of that right. Other delegates were horrified. As I understand the suggestion, it means that if the federal parliament chooses to legislate in respect of a uniform suffrage in the Commonwealth, it cannot do so unless it makes it include female suffrage. It ties the hands of the federal parliament entirely. If the clause were not approved, Holder and Kingston threatened that South Australia would vote against joining the Commonwealth. The racial qualifier is key. The earlier legislation that entrenched the White Australia Policy "the Immigration Restriction Act of " was also the crucial prerequisite that made Goldstein the freest of the free when she visited America in Further, in preserving the existing rights of colonists and extending them to all white adults, the Franchise Act of had stripped Indigenous Australians of voting rights. As historian Susan Magarey has argued: Citizenship, as defined by the right to vote, could be sexually inclusive, because it had just been made racially and ethnically exclusive. Race, not gender, defined the new Australian citizen. Historian Marilyn Lake has argued that in an international context, the federal female franchise ushered in an era of unprecedented political power for women. But what did people at the time make of the opportunistic alignment of feminism and federalism? Spreading influence The majority of political pundits reckoned that the social laboratory had not spawned a monster. The result has not produced either a heaven or a hell. The Australian suffrage campaigners were correct to see federalism as their ticket to public influence on the grandest scale. Leaders like Goldstein readily adopted the role of international ambassador for the enlightened dawn of a new century. We Australian women who have had our right to political liberty granted by the national parliaments and by every state parliament save one [Victoria], have been appealed to by the International Woman Suffrage Alliance to help our less fortunate fellow women in other lands. The appeal was most forthcoming from nations: Goldstein pressed the statesmen to write testimonies to the successful workings of complete adult suffrage in Australian political life. She was obliged with an avalanche of letters, including responses from Prime Minister Alfred Deakin, as well as testimonies from the attorney-general,

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

postmaster-general and state premiers. Because [universal suffrage] has brought nothing but good, though disaster was freely prophesised [sic], we respectfully urge that all nations enjoying representative government would be well advised in granting votes to women. If this sounds fresh, there was more hubris to come. Our young Australian nation is bound to achieve greatness. Why such a glorious destiny? And it was not just women who thought as much. Woman suffrage has done for Australia all and more than its leaders claimed for it. No self-governing country can prosper without the political aid of women. It is a necessary factor in securing the moral and spiritual progress of the individual and of the nation. The senators were highly aware of the inherent role reversal in the colonies giving political tuition to the Empire. One claimed that Australia "though the child" had every right to give advice to Britain "the mother." We are, in politics, the pacemakers of the world. It might even be that the establishment of the Anzac legend and the trumpeting of a distinctive, world-leading constitutional equity were two sides of the same coin. Though not all first-wave feminists agreed, militarism and maternalism were not necessarily mutually exclusive. The belief that Australia had something valuable to contribute to the world continued beyond the disastrous landing at Gallipoli on April 25. While ostensibly a message of hope to King George V, it was not a felicitation for his newly named House of Windsor, nor a pledge of solidarity for the war effort. It was, instead, an appeal for political reform, bordering on a taunt to keep up with the precocious Australians. The parliamentary missive began: Appreciating the blessings of self-government in Australia through adult suffrage, we are deeply interested in the welfare of the women of the Empire and we again humbly petition Your Majesty to endow them with that right of self-government for which they have petitioned for nearly three-quarters of a century. Perhaps this can be read as the trademark tactic of an adolescent, cutting an arrogant parent down to size with evidence of her own incompetence. But more likely, Australians were deeply aware of the unique contribution they had made to the advancement of democratic principles and institutions "a profound sense of commitment to the international cause of political equality, spurred on by confidence in their own social experiment of change and reform. Maturity was not simply tested by readiness for war. Australia was reaping the reward of having responded to the unanswerable appeal to justice. The banner, painted by the Australian expatriate artist Dora Meeson Coates, dripped with symbolism.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, AND COMPLETE EQUALITY IN CITIZENSHIP, THE SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS pdf

Natural Desire for God The Unemployment Crisis in Australia The rhetoricity of historical knowledge: Pauline discourse and its contextualizations 4. Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin in the gathering storm Barnes Noble Health Basics Menopause Messengers of day. Nintendo Games Secrets, Volume 2 Essentials of quebec business law 4th edition 1. Political thought and the language of politics: art and politics On The Edge of Red V. 2. Furman v. Georgia School Integration and Busing Advanced Linux Networking Introduction to Criminology, Law, and Society (C7) Caring for the disabled elderly: the economics and ethics of financing long-term care Nancy S. Jecker Leading groups and teams Macromedia Flash MX ActionScript May Days, Barcelona 1937 Great War and womens consciousness Fifty shades of grey part 4 Fingerprint vehicle starter project The agony of Paul Gauguin Lenin and the revolution Pt. 3. East Goscote Hundred Management practices and cost management problems in Japanese-affiliated companies in the United Kingdom Early Irish literature Wordpress for business bloggers Interpreting Lysis More than a touch Cisa all in one exam guide 2nd edition Sodium Channels, Pain, and Analgesia (Progress in Inflammation Research) Bob Dylan: Watching the River Flow Theodore Roosevelt, the U.S. Navy, and the Spanish-American War Vlc media player user guide Diary of a young girl fulll text Extra Work for Brain Surgeons Peasantry and the early absolute monarchy in Denmark, 1660-1708 Investment by charles p jones 11th edition Transforming private landlords Wolfsbane andrea cremer Richard II: The Life and Death of King Richard the Second